

BI
can't
implant, said first predetermined size being less than that of the graft-unoccupied portion of said tunnel at a second point adjacent the distal end of the tunnel, said second point being distal of said primary surgical implant and longitudinally spaced distally from said first point, said secondary implant comprising:

a body having a second predetermined size smaller than said first diameter to enable said body to fit within said bone tunnel distal end but greater than said first predetermined size whereby said body is too large to come out of said bone tunnel past said primary surgical implant; and

means to enable said body to be secured to said ligament graft. --

REMARKS

In the previous Amendment Applicant inadvertently referenced claim 1 in several places in the Remarks section when, in fact, claim 5 should have been mentioned. Claim 5 has in effect replaced claim 1. Applicant apologizes for this inadvertent error but does not believe that this had any effect on the Office Action.

In the Office Action of September 7, 2000 the Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 6 to be dependent on claim 5.

The Examiner also rejected claims 7 through 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thein. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for reasons presented in the previous Amendment. However, to advance the prosecution of this case, claim 7 has been amended to be a combination claim.

Applicant notes that while claim 7-14 were rejected as a group, the Examiner only commented on claim 7. Consequently, independent claims 9 and 11 technically